



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/509,808	08/24/2000	Roland Fischer	F-6485	9821
7590		12/28/2004	EXAMINER	
Jordan & Hamburg		FERGUSON, LAWRENCE D		
122 East 42nd Street		ART UNIT		
New York, NY 10168		PAPER NUMBER		
		1774		

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/509,808

Applicant(s)

FISCHER ET AL.

Examiner

Lawrence D. Ferguson

Art Unit

1774

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 September 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 24-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 August 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the amendment mailed September 30, 2004.

Claim 24 is amended rendering Claims 24-31 are pending, with claims 32-46 withdrawn from consideration.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103(a)

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 24-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto (U.S. 5,485,685).

Hashimoto discloses a wood block, where the ligin in the wood structure is melted (column 4, lines 5-8 and lines 58-61) and the oil and fat components of wood are melted (column 6, lines 1-5). The melted ligin in the wood's cell structure ensures the coloring of the wood with a dye that can penetrate deep into the wood's interior (column 5, lines 1-7) where the melted ligin of the wood is physically altered from its original state. In instant claim 24, the phrase, "being created by exposure of at least a portion of the article of wood to an increased temperature which raises the wood comprising said

Art Unit: 1774

at least a portion of the article of wood above a melting point thereof” introduces a process limitation to the product claim. Additionally, in instant claim 25, the phrase “cell walls melted in one or several cutting directions” also introduces a process limitation to the product claim. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.” In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966. Further, process limitations are given no patentable weight in product claims. Hashimoto is silent as to the wood melts being free from pyrolytic degradation as per instant claim 24. Since no such degradation is disclosed as being present, the limitation of claim 24 is met. Although Hashimoto does not explicitly disclose the melted areas having a higher hardness and abrasion resistance than the non-melted wood as in instant claim 27, the claimed hardness and abrasion resistance are directly related to the melted wood parts. Since Hashimoto teaches the same components as Applicant, these features would be expected, absent any evidence to the contrary.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103(a)

4. Claims 24-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto (U.S. 5,784,805).

Hashimoto discloses a wood block, where the ligin in the wood structure is melted (column 4, lines 5-9 and lines 59-61) and the oil and fat components of wood are

Art Unit: 1774

melted (column 6, lines 1-5). The melted ligin in the wood's cell structure ensures the coloring of the wood with a dye that can penetrate deep into the wood's interior (column 5, lines 1-9) where the melted ligin of the wood is physically altered from its original state. In instant claim 24, the phrase, "being created by exposure of at least a portion of the article of wood to an increased temperature which raises the wood comprising said at least a portion of the article of wood above a melting point thereof" introduces a process limitation to the product claim. Additionally, in instant claim 25, the phrase, "cell walls melted in one or several cutting directions" introduces a process limitation to the product claim. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966. Further, process limitations are given no patentable weight in product claims. Hashimoto is silent as to the wood melts being free from pyrolitic degradation as per instant claim 24. Since no such degradation is disclosed as being present, the limitation of claim 24 is met. Although Hashimoto does not explicitly disclose the melted areas having a higher hardness and abrasion resistance than the non-melted wood as in instant claim 27, the claimed hardness and abrasion resistance are directly related to the melted wood parts. Since Hashimoto teaches the same components as Applicant, these features would be expected, absent any evidence to the contrary.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments of rejection under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto (U.S. 5,485,685) have been considered but are unpersuasive. Applicant argues since the resulting products made in accordance with the present claims and Hashimoto have a different structural nature, the product by process claims of claims 24-31 distinguish over the cited reference. In amended claim 24, the phrase, "being created by exposure of at least a portion of the article of wood to an increased temperature which raises the wood comprising said at least a portion of the article of wood above a melting point thereof" introduces a process limitation to the product claim. Additionally, in instant claim 25, the phrase, "cell walls melted in one or several cutting directions" introduces a process limitation to the product claim. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966. Further, process limitations are given no patentable weight in product claims. Examiner maintains Hashimoto discloses a melted wood component, which meets the instantly claimed invention.

Applicant's arguments of rejection under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto (U.S. 5,784,805) have been considered but are unpersuasive. Applicant argues since the resulting products made in accordance with the present claims and Hashimoto '805 have a different structural nature, the product by process

Art Unit: 1774

claims of claims 24-31 distinguish over the cited reference. In amended claim 24, the phrase, "being created by exposure of at least a portion of the article of wood to an increased temperature which raises the wood comprising said at least a portion of the article of wood above a melting point thereof" introduces a process limitation to the product claim. Additionally, in instant claim 25, the phrase, "cell walls melted in one or several cutting directions" introduces a process limitation to the product claim. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966. Further, process limitations are given no patentable weight in product claims. Examiner maintains Hashimoto '805 discloses a melted wood component, which meets the instantly claimed invention.

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 1774

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion


7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lawrence Ferguson whose telephone number is 571-272-1522. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9:00 AM – 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye, can be reached on 571-272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Lawrence Ferguson
Patent Examiner
AU 1774



RENA DYE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

A.U. 1774

12/22/09